DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 416 704 FL 025 202

AUTHOR	Teweles, Bill
TITLE	Motivation as a Two-Sided Coin: Motivational Differences between College-Level Chinese and Japanese Learners of EFL.
PUB DATE	1995-00-00
NOTE	22p.; For related document, see FL 025 200.
PUB TYPE	Journal Articles (080) -- Reports - Research (143)
JOURNAL CIT	Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education; v2 n1 Spr 1995
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	College Freshmen; College Sophomores; College Students; *Educational Attitudes; *English (Second Language); Foreign Countries; Higher Education; *Language Attitudes; *Language Proficiency; Language Research; *Learning Motivation; Second Language Instruction; Second Language Learning; Student Attitudes; *Student Motivation
IDENTIFIERS	Chinese People; Japanese People

ABSTRACT

To determine relative levels of motivation in learning English as a Second Language, 40 freshman and sophomores at 2 national universities in mainland China and Japan responded to a 40-point attitudinal questionnaire and 6-point followup motivational intensity scale. Data on student language proficiency were also gathered. While a solid majority from both universities showed high motivation on the attitudinal measure (87.5 percent of the Japanese and 95 percent of the Chinese), the backup motivational intensity scale, designed to tap a more active orientation to the target language, yielded a more modest 50.6 percent and 67.8 percent positive response, respectively, on the part of the respondents. In addition to showing a somewhat higher instrumental motivation to learn English, it is noteworthy that the Mandarin-speaking freshmen and sophomores also outperformed Japanese college learners of similar age and background on a variety of tests focusing on points of syntax of near-equal difficulty for both language groups. Level of motivation was not shown to correlate highly with proficiency regardless of test type, which parallels findings of earlier studies. Contains 25 references. (Author/MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 416 704

Motivation as a Two-Sided Coin: Motivational Differences Between College-Level Chinese and Japanese Learners of EFL

BILL TEWELES

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to
improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this
document do not necessarily represent
official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Mark Carpenter
John Provenzo
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FL025 202

Motivation as a Two-Sided Coin: Motivational Differences Between College-Level Chinese and Japanese Learners of EFL

BILL TEWELES

Forty freshmen and sophomores at two national universities in Mainland China and Japan responded to a 40-point attitudinal questionnaire and 6-point follow-up motivational intensity scale in an effort to determine relative levels of motivation. While a solid majority of students from both universities showed high motivation on the former (87.5% of the Japanese freshmen and sophomores and 95% of the Chinese freshmen and sophomores), the backup motivational intensity scale, designed to tap a more active orientation to the target language (English), yielded a more modest 50.6% and 67.8% positive response on the part of the Japanese and Mandarin-speaking respondents. In addition to showing a somewhat higher instrumental motivation to learn English, it is noteworthy that the Mandarin-speaking freshmen and sophomores also outperformed Japanese college learners of similar age and background on a variety of tests focusing on points of syntax of near-equal difficulty for both language groups. Level of motivation was not shown to correlate highly with proficiency regardless of test-type, which parallels findings by Oller, Hudson, and Liu (1977) and Chihara and Oller (1978) that attitude and language proficiency are not always closely associated.

INTRODUCTION

A one-year matched group study conducted at Hunan University, a large national university in Changsha, Hunan Province, Peoples Republic of China and Okayama (National) University in Okayama City, Japan revealed that there are some differences between the levels of "instrumental" as opposed to "integrative" motivation reported by two groups of freshmen and sophomores at both universities. Based on the first of a pair of attitudinal questionnaires, a slight leaning toward "instrumental" motivation was shown by the Mandarin-speaking freshmen and sophomores, with their Japanese-speaking counterparts being slightly more inclined toward "integrative" motivational indicators.[1] Nevertheless, when a follow-up "motivational intensity scale" based on the one designed by Gardner and Lambert (1972) is taken into consideration, a more negative or distant attitude toward English is shown on the part of the Japanese freshmen and sophomores.

This seems to confirm findings by Benson (1991), who in surveying over 300 college freshmen in the same region of Japan, found that "personal" motivation was a more appropriate way to gauge interest in and application to the second

[1]In the former case, the target language is seen as being potentially useful, but is often largely academic in its treatment and use and may only have an indirect effect on the learner outside the classroom, whereas in the latter, it may take on a communicative role that directly affects the learner in everyday life.

language (in this case, English). Further statistical analysis shows there to be a weak-to-moderate correlation between motivation level (as shown on the first Likert-scale centered attitudinal questionnaire) and proficiency level shown on a battery of tests taken by both groups of EFL learners at Hunan University and Okayama University. These findings suggest that the importance of a positive attitude toward the target language (or target language-speaking community) is not as important as the presentation of a strong commitment to practice and will to actually use the language in question.

METHODOLOGY

Subjects

Two Groups of Freshmen (n=10) and two Groups of Sophomores (n=10) at Hunan University (18 Females and 2 Males in the Freshman Group and 13 Females and 7 Males in the Sophomore Group), and two Groups of Freshmen (n=10) and two Groups of Sophomores (n=10) at Okayama University (11 Females and 9 Males in the Freshman Group and 18 Females and 2 Males in the Sophomore Group) participated in this study.

Procedures

All students who had indicated on a consent agreement that they would participate in a comparative study of EFL learning being conducted in China and Japan and be willing to take a series of written tests were asked on the second day of testing to complete a two-part "Attitudinal Questionnaire." The purpose of this was twofold; one was an attempt to gauge via 5-point Likert scale whether students were "instrumentally" or "integratively" motivated. Eight of the ten statements (evenly divided between instrumental and integrative-type assessments of English) on this first questionnaire were drawn from Gardner and Lambert (1972) and were worth a total of 40 points. An additional yes/no question (#7) asked if the student was mainly taking English in order to gain college course credit. A final open question (#10) gave students a chance to elaborate on any of the reasons given or other personal reasons for learning English (see Appendix A). A questionnaire made up of six additional yes/no questions was included as a follow-up to the first questionnaire. These questions were more closely directed to the individual English language learner, and were designed as a check on how "active" or "personally committed" the particular learner was to the target language (i.e., outside the classroom). The numerical difference between "yes" and "no" responses on the second questionnaire was also intended to help determine assignment to a "HIGH" or "LOW" motivation level; thirty-two points (70%) or higher on both questionnaires signifying "HI MOtivation." Similarly, a respondent earning twenty-eight points or fewer on the initial questionnaire and not scoring four or more points on the second part would be considered "LO MOtivation."

The Role of Motivation in the Two Different EFL Contexts Involved

Gardner and Lambert's (1972) studies in North America during the late 1950's and 1960's brought the special role of attitude and motivation into the second language acquisition research fold. In addition to bringing up the important distinction between "instrumental" and "integrative" orientations to a target

language and to the target culture which it represents, their research helped substantiate the key role of the affective domain associated with "integrative motivation." [2] Somewhat apart from their original intention of showing how English was helping Asian nations "become an integral part of a worldwide community" (ibid., p. 122), their study on ESL in the Philippines has helped substantiate the "instrumental" role that English appears to have so strongly assumed in Asia. Since then, a number of linguists and researchers (Fu, 1975; Kachru, 1977; Chihara and Oller, 1978; Young, 1982; Shaw et al., 1983) have focused on other ESL and EFL contexts in Asia and noted the particularly strong link between an instrumental motive and proficiency in English, mostly among adolescent or adult learners.

The People's Republic of China and Japan present particularly challenging and complex EFL settings in this regard. English clearly has a dual function in both countries; as a language that is broadly linked to external knowledge and advanced technology, it is widely sought as a means of bringing new information into the home culture. In addition to this perception of English being a window unto the Western world of art, science and technology, many in China and Japan view their own languages as being nearly impossible for non-native speakers to learn (Reischauer, 1977). This feeling that English is a *necessity* for wider communication in today's world is perhaps the closest thing to a consensus that exists between the two vis a vis English language instruction. A remark made by a freshman informant from Okayama University (in Japanese) on the second attitude questionnaire may be considered exemplary here:

> "*Genzai no kokusai shakai no naka de hitsuyoo to sarete iru kara.*"
> (English) has become a necessity in today's modern society.

A sophomore at Hunan University added another prevailing view:

> "English is a useful communicational [sic] tool to study advanced Western technique."

Aside from the functional role that English plays in the mostly academic context that a national university represents, one needs to consider the image and influence of English on both the developing and developed socioeconomic structures that China and Japan represent. Visiting the People's Republic in the Fall of 1974 with an entourage of eminent linguistic scholars, it was noted in Lehmann (1975) that the most commonly expressed motivation for studying English was "to serve the revolution" (p. 76). Whether this can be considered "instrumental" or "integrative" motivation is beside the point here; suffice it to say that twenty years later, in the heart of Hunan Province where Chairman Mao was born, raised and educated, such pronouncements are rarely heard (or expected) in English class. As Berendt (1990) has documented in describing the multi-faceted role of English in today's China, proficiency in English is increasingly seen as a "passport" to opportunity-- a means of diversifying one's livelihood and increasing one's pay,

---

[2]The usage of a 70% or higher cutoff is consistent with collegiate marking standards in both Mainland China and Japan, whereby 70% is considered indicative of "good" performance.

and also essential to seeking educational and economic opportunities overseas. Importantly, it is also felt that English plays a major role in the country's modernization, especially in the areas of science and technology.

The Japanese, to a greater extent, have sought to incorporate English vocabulary into their own language through development of a syllabary, or "katakana," designed to mark words or phrases of foreign origin. (For the Chinese, who have shown that they prefer to let separate linguistic entities be seen and treated as such, there is no such ready-made device, although a few "loan words" have been admitted into the language and are identifiable, although normally "spelled out" with Chinese ideographs). Visitors to Japan often marvel at the variety of ways and means English plants itself onto the urban landscape.[3] Its extensive appearance in the media and expression in fashion is a fact of life in most Japanese cities today.

In contrast, English is used more sparingly in Mainland China; while pressures to use more English in advertising exist, it is rarely used in the decorative sense there that it is in Japan. It is evident, too, that these two ancient cultures, which have influenced each other so greatly over the past several centuries, are somewhat resistant to the forces of Westernization, and one should be cautious about overstating the role of any one language. In spite of the high literacy levels and general recognition of the importance of English in Japan, the average Japanese "has little incentive to master English or any other foreign language" (Hansen, 1985, p. 147). And in China, many feel that Mandarin, as it is used by the most people in the world, should be considered as highly as English as a choice for international language. A debate on this subject in an Oral English class observed by this researcher last year raised many convincing arguments along this line, students arguing for Mandarin's grammatical simplicity and richness of semantic expression. While similar arguments might be raised in favor of other languages (the relative ease of pronouncing Japanese compared to either English or Mandarin comes to mind), the current prestige of English worldwide and its uncontested role in international business, communications and diplomacy remain.

More crucial than any of these considerations for the average Japanese or Chinese citizen, perhaps, is the pervasive role English plays in the entrance examination and educational systems of each country. As many as 90% in some urban centers of China (Ross, 1993) and some 99% of Japanese youth (Maher, 1984, LoCastro, 1990) study English in middle or high school for mostly test-related reasons. The tremendous social pressures involved and difficulty of the entrance examinations themselves is well-chronicled (Reischauer 1977; Cambridge Encyclopedia of Japan, Newsweek 1/12/87 et al.). Crucial to the discussion here, too, is the (after)effect of the entrance examination system on the college undergraduate. As Berwick and Ross (1989) attest, the psychological impact of these exams is considerable and creates a "burnout" effect in some cases. There is also much controversy in Japan over the content of the English examinations themselves (Buck, 1988; LoCastro, 1990) and whether what the students are being tested on reflects their true ability or needs, especially in communicative skills. For the most part, at least on the Joint Achievement Test (JAT) given to determine eligibility to

[3]An article entitled "All Tongue-Tied" in the August 8, 1987 edition of Asiaweek noted that "A touch of English always looks nice" to many Japanese (p. 26).

take the entrance examinations offered by individual national universities in Japan, knowledge of English grammatical structure and ability to translate from English into the first language determines who passes. While the actual content of the English portion of the national entrance examinations are a subject of less controversy in China, the stakes involved are perhaps even higher as entrance exams are only offered on a once-a-year basis. Even though the number of universities being built in the municipal and private sector is increasing in both countries, the prestige attached and advantages of attending a national university are considerable.

Given the particular weight of English for testing purposes in both China and Japan, it is not surprising that of the fifty-two informants who responded to an "extra" (i.e., not entered into the "integrative" vs. "instrumental" motivation score count assigned) question on whether English should be required in high school, seventeen (85%) from Okayama University "agreed," while two were "not sure" and only one "disagreed." At Hunan University, thirty students (93.75%) agreed, one was "not sure," and one "disagreed."

A second question on the first attitudinal questionnaire that was also not figured into the overall motivational score asked whether the student was "taking English mainly to gain course credit." Looking at the breakdown of responses given by the forty students in each of the profiled groups, there was a considerably greater attitudinal difference shown herein than for the previous question on English's importance in the high school curriculum.

Q-7 "I am taking English mainly to gain college course credit."

OKAYAMA UNIV. SOPHS. (n=20)	YES	15	NO	5	TOTAL = 75% YES
OKAYAMA UNIV. FROSH (n=20)	YES	12	NO	8	TOTAL = 60% YES
HUNAN UNIV. SOPHS (n=20)	YES	0	NO	20	TOTAL =100% NO
HUNAN UNIV. FROSH (n=20; *one freshman did not respond)	YES	0	NO	19	TOTAL =95% NO*

It is noteworthy that while 67.5% of the Japanese students responded "negatively" to this question (a "yes" answer indicating that they were only taking English to get course credit and would not bother to take it otherwise), all of the Chinese students replied "affirmatively." The unanimity of the Chinese students on this question underlines the positive response they showed on the first (eight question) attitudinal questionnaire as a whole. Hunan University students compiled an average of 33.45 instrumental motivation points out of 40, or 83.625%, and an integrative mean score of 32.85 out of 40, or 82.125%. That nearly three-fourths of the Okayama University students indicated having little academic interest in English aside from its satisfying a graduation requirement calls into question or compromises the generally high mean scores they produced on the first attitudinal questionnaire. On this, Okayama University students averaged 29.95 instrumental motivation points of out of 40, or 74.875%, and had an integrative mean score of 31.65 out of 40, or 79.125%. In spite of the fact that an abbreviated

version of Gardner and Lambert's (1972) Attitude and Motivational Index was used, it is noteworthy, but not surprising that Japanese students tended to score higher on integrative indicators than did the Chinese informants. Berwick and Ross (1989) and Benson (1991) both elaborated on the considerable fall-off in "instrumental" interest (particularly in freshman learners of English) once the college entrance examination was history. Responses to a more elaborate "Supplementary Questionnaire" (Appendix C) taken by a class of 29 juniors at Kyoto University of Foreign Studies in the spring of 1994 also support Benson's view that a more "personal" motivation begins to take hold of the Japanese undergraduate once "instrumental motivation" has run its course. In it, an equally favorable view of English to that held by 23 of the sophomore group at Hunan University in various skill areas was shown, ranging from a high mean score of 4.1724 (on a Likert scale of five) on pronunciation to a "low" of 3.1724 on vocabulary. While not designed to directly tap into considerations of instrumental and integrative motivation, the questionnaire was able to bring out both positive and negative views toward the target language and culture as well as elicit the following examples of "personal motivation."

Sample Responses by Juniors at Kyoto University of Foreign Studies to Supplementary Questionnaire

Q:1 What topics do you feel comfortable using English to talk about?
"Hobby, friendship, (and) relationship between men and women"
"Music, family, myself"

Q:3 What do you like most about English as a second language?
"It's my dream to go abroad and speak with foreigner."
"It's more informal than my native language."
"I can be another person and freely express myself."
"It allows you to communicate with people from countries other than English-speaking countries."

Q:6 What do you like most about English-speaking people?
"Their speech...is great with some jokes which draws the audience within."

Other responses indicated a considerable level of complexity, or decidedly mixed attitudes toward the subject language and culture.

Q:6 What do you like most about English-speaking people?
"They are friendly and kind."

(same respondent)
Q:7 "What do you dislike most about them?
"They are insensitive, generally, I think."

DISCUSSION

As Tables 1, 2, 3 and 4 below reveal, all four groups of freshmen and sophomores at Okayama and Hunan Universities showed relatively high levels of motivation (i.e., 32+ points) on the first questionnaire, with a slight preference for Integrative Motivational indicators shown by both Japanese groups and a preference for Instrumental Motivational indicators shown by both Chinese groups.

Table 1. Responses of Freshman Groups at Okayama University

OKAYAMA UNIVERSITY STUDENT NO.	TOTAL SCORE HI/LO MOTIV.	INSTRUMENTAL	INTEGRATIVE
1/05-321	32 (+ 4 yes) HI	17	15
2/05-322	31 (+ 5 yes) HI	16	15
3/05-324	27 (+ 4 yes) LO	13	14
4/05-328	34 (+ 4 yes) HI	17	17
5/05-332	28 (+ 3 yes) LO	14	14
6/05-334	32 (+ 4 yes) HI	16	16
7/05-336	31 (+ 4 yes) HI	15	16
8/05-507	30 (+ 3 yes) HI	15	15
9/05-521	33 (+ 4 yes) HI	16	18
10/05-523	31 (+ 3 yes) HI	15	16
n=10 FRESHMEN	8 HI/2 LO MO	ave. 15.4	ave. 15.6

OKAYAMA UNIVERSITY STUDENT NO.	TOTAL SCORE	INSTRUMENTAL	INTEGRATIVE
11/M034	35 (+ 3 yes) HI	19	16
12/M044	32 (+ 4 yes) HI	16	16
13/M049	25 (+ 6 no) LO	10	15
14/M053	21 (+ 6 no) LO	11	10
15/M057	29 (+ 5 no) LO	12	17
16/M061	29 (+ 3 yes) HI	15	14
17/M064	32 (+ 3 yes) HI	15	17
18/M090	28 (+ 5 yes) HI	14	14
19/M095	32 (+ 5 yes) HI	16	16
20/M108	23 (+ 6 no) LO	12	11
n=10 FRESHMEN	6 HI /4 LO MO	ave. 14.0	ave. 14.6

Two Group Total on MOTIVATION MEAN SCORES

Okayama University	INSTRUMENTAL	INTEGRATIVE
•Freshmen (n=20)	14.7	15.1

Table 2. Responses of Sophomore Groups at Okayama University

OKAYAMA UNIVERSITY STUDENT NO.	TOTAL SCORE HI/LO MOTIV.	INSTRUMENTAL	INTEGRATIVE
1/05-1	24 (+ 5 no) LO	12	12
2/05-2	37 (+ 3 yes) HI	18	19
3/05-4	25 (+ 5 yes) LO	10	15
4/05-5	36 (+ 5 yes) HI	18	18
5/05-6	31 (+ 4 no) HI	13	18
6/05-15	29 (+ 6 no) LO	15	14
7/05-17	31 (+ 5 no) HI	16	15
8/05-18	30 (+ 4 no) HI	14	16
9/05-19	33 (+ 3 yes) HI	14	19
10/05-21	33 (+ 4 yes) HI	15	18
n=10 SOPHOMORES	7 HI /3 LO MO	ave. 14.5	ave. 16.4

OKAYAMA UNIVERSITY STUDENT NO.	TOTAL SCORE HI/LO MOTIV	INSTRUMENTAL	INTEGRATIVE
11/05-27	30 (+ 4 no) HI	14	16
12/05-28	32 (+ 4 yes) HI	15	17
13/05-30	36 (+ 6 yes) HI	18	18
14/05-31	33 (+ 4 yes) HI	15	18
15/05-35	31 (+ 4 yes) HI	15	16
16/05-41	37 (+ 5 yes) HI	19	18
17/05-44	30 (+ 4 no) HI	15	15
18/05-45	29 (+ 5 no) LO	15	14
19/05-46	34 (+ 5 yes) HI	17	17
20/05-50	32 (+ 3 yes) HI	17	15
n=10 SOPHOMORES	9 HI /1 LO MO	ave. 16.0	ave. 16.4

Two Group Total on MOTIVATION MEAN SCORES

Okayama University	INSTRUMENTAL	INTEGRATIVE
•Sophomores (n=20)	15.25	16.4

Table 3. Responses of Freshman Groups at Hunan University

HUNAN UNIV. STUDENTS*	TOTAL SCORE HI/LO MOTIV.	INSTRUMEN-TAL	INTEGRATIVE
1/Catherine	39 (+ 4 yes) HI	20	19
2/Emily	36 (+ 4 yes) HI	19	17
3/Frank	33 (+ 4 yes) HI	15	18
4/Haoping	37 (+ 4 yes) HI	19	18
5/Huying	39 (+ 5 yes) HI	19	20
6/LinDan	31 (+ 4 yes) HI	16	15
7/Shirley	34 (+ 5 yes) HI	16	18
8/Stephanie	30 (+ 6 yes) HI	16	14
9/Sue	35 (+ 3 yes) HI	17	18
10/Xiaoxi	35 (+ 4 yes) HI	19	16
n=10 FRESHMEN	All HI MO on Q's 1-16	ave. 17.6	ave. 17.3

*Names used in place of student numbers by Hunan freshman groups

HUNAN UNIV. STUDENTS	TOTAL SCORE	INSTRUMENTAL	INTEGRATIVE
11/Bing	31 (+ 4 yes) HI	14	17
12/Emmy	39 (+ 3 yes) HI	19	20
13/Fang	36 (+ 3 yes) HI	18	18
14/Julia	30 (+ 3 yes) HI	17	13
15/Lili	34 (+ 4 yes) HI	19	15
16/Lillian	26 (+ 3 yes) LO	11	15
17/May	35 (+ 6 yes) HI	18	17
18/Rocket	32 (+ 4 yes) HI	18	14
19/Sandy	28 (+ 5 yes) HI	14	14
20/Wendy	35 (+ 5 yes) HI	17	18
n=10 FRESHMEN	9 HI /1 LO MO	ave. 16.5	ave. 16.1

Two Group Total on MOTIVATION MEAN SCORES

Hunan University	INSTRUMENTAL	INTEGRATIVE
•Freshmen (n=20)	17.05	16.7

Table 4. Responses of Sophomore Groups at Hunan University

HUNAN UNIV. STUDENT NO.	TOTAL SCORE HI/LO MOTIV.	INSTRUMENTAL	INTEGRATIVE
1/5028	33 (+ 4 yes) HI	16	17
2/5032	32 (+ 4 yes) HI	17	15
3/5033	36 (+ 5 yes) HI	17	19
4/5034	36 (+ 4 yes) HI	18	18
5/5035	29 (+ 3 yes) HI	13	16
6/5037	36 (+ 5 yes) HI	18	18
7/5038	34 (+ 5 yes) HI	18	16
8/5039	39 (+ 5 yes) HI	20	19
9/5040	34 (+ 5 yes) HI	18	16
10/5041	32 (+ 4 yes) HI	16	16
n=10 SOPHOMORES	All HI MO	ave. 17.1	ave. 17.0

HUNAN UNIV. STUDENT NO.	TOTAL SCORE HI/LO MOTIV.	INSTRUMENTAL	INTEGRATIVE
11/5043	38 (+ 4 yes) HI	20	18
12/5044	28 (+ 4 yes) HI	13	15
13/5045	20 (+ 4 no) LO	11	9
14/5047	35 (+ 5 yes) HI	18	17
15/5048	33 (+ 4 yes) HI	16	17
16/5050	31 (+ 4 yes) HI	16	15
17/5051	31 (+ 4 no) HI	16	15
18/5052	31 (No Resp)HI	16	15
19/5054	33 (+ 3 yes) HI	17	16
20/5055	30 (+ 4 no) HI	14	16
n=10 SOPHOMORES	9 HI /1 LO MO	ave. 15.7	ave. 15.3

Two Group Total on MOTIVATION MEAN SCORES

Hunan University	INSTRUMENTAL	INTEGRATIVE
•Sophomores (n=20)	16.4	16.15

Due to expected glossing of responses on questions designed to elicit "instrumental" and "integrative" motivation (i.e., the "approval motive" that Oller 1981 noted often colors self-reported attitudes), the aforementioned six-point backup questionnaire based on Gardner and Lambert's (1972) "Motivational Intensity Scale" was attached to the main ten-question attitudinal questionnaire. Herein, freshmen and sophomores at both schools were asked questions which aimed to highlight a more active orientation toward the target language. Notably, there were directional differences (highlighted in bold print) between the response patterns of half of the sophomores and for one-third of the freshmen from both universities on these

questions. Responses on this portion of the Attitudinal Questionnaire for the twenty sophomores profiled from each school were as follows:

Q:1 Do you plan to continue learning or to use English after you graduate from college?

HUNAN UNIV. (Sophs.)	# YES 18	# NO 1	NO RESP./TOTAL 1 / 90% yes
OKAYAMA UNIV. (Sophs.)	# YES 14	# NO 5	NO RESP./TOTAL 1 / 70% yes

Q:2 Do you spend more than the minimum time on most of your English class (homework) assignments?

HUNAN SOPHS.	# YES 6	# NO 13	NO RESP./TOTAL 1 / 65% no
OKAYAMA SOPHS.	# YES 9	# NO 11	NO RESP./TOTAL 0 / 55% no

Q:3 Do you make use of the English language outside of school?

HUNAN SOPHS.	# YES 6	# NO 13	NO RESP./TOTAL 1 / 65% no
OKAYAMA SOPHS.	# YES 11	# NO 9	NO RESP./TOTAL 0 / 55% yes

Q:4 Do you ever practice English outside of class/ attempt to converse with native speakers?

HUNAN SOPHS.	# YES 10	# NO 9	NO RESP./TOTAL 1 / 50% yes
OKAYAMA SOPHS.	# YES 2	# NO 18	NO RESP./TOTAL 0 / 90% no

Q:5 Is improving your English important to you aside from getting a good mark in school?

HUNAN SOPHS.	# YES 18	NO 1	NO RESP./TOTAL 1 / 90% yes
OKAYAMA SOPHS.	# YES 17	NO 3	NO RESP./TOTAL 0 / 85% yes

Q:6 If English were not a required subject, would you take time to learn it?

	# YES	# NO	NO RESP./TOTAL
HUNAN SOPHS.	17	2	1 / 85% yes
OKAYAMA SOPHS.	8	11	1 / 55% no

CUMULATIVE TOTAL:			
(HUNAN SOPHS.)	75 YES	39 NO	65.8% yes
(does not include 6 no response)			
(OKAYAMA SOPHS.)	61 YES	57 NO	51.7% yes
(does not include 2 no response)			

Responses on the same portion of the Attitudinal Questionnaire for the 20 freshmen profiled from each school were as follows:

Q:1	# YES	# NO	NO RESP./TOTAL
HUNAN UNIV.	20	0	0 / 100% yes
OKAYAMA UNIV.	14	6	0 / 70% yes

Q:2	# YES	# NO	NO RESP./TOTAL
HUNAN UNIV.	7	12	1 / 60% no
OKAYAMA UNIV.	13	7	0 / 65% yes

Q:3	# YES	# NO	NO RESP./TOTAL
HUNAN UNIV.	6	14	0 70% no
OKAYAMA UNIV.	1	19	0 95% no

Q:4	# YES	# NO	NO RESP./TOTAL
HUNAN UNIV.	12	8	0 60% yes
OKAYAMA UNIV.	2	18	0 90% no

Q:5	# YES	# NO	NO RESP./TOTAL
HUNAN UNIV.	19	1	0 95% yes
OKAYAMA UNIV.	16	4	0 80% yes

Q:6	# YES	# NO	NO RESP./TOTAL
HUNAN UNIV.	19	1	0 95% yes
OKAYAMA UNIV.	13	6	1 65% yes

CUMULATIVE TOTAL			
(HUNAN FROSH)	83 YES	36 NO	69.75% yes
(does not include 1 no response)			
(OKAYAMA FROSH)	59 YES	60 NO	50.42% no
(does not include 1 no response)			
COMBINED TOTAL			
(HUNAN Frosh+Sophs.)	158 YES	75 NO	67.81%* YES
(OKAYAMA Frosh+Sophs.)	120 YES	117 NO	50.633%** YES

*does not include 7 no response **does not include 3 no response

Using adjusted scores of 32 or above as a cut-off point, 14 of 20 freshmen and 16 of 20 sophomores at Okayama University showed HI MOtivation, whereas 19 of 20 students at Hunan University in both freshman and sophomore groups placed into HI MOtivation groups. The fact that such a large majority of students expressed motivation to improve their English and, to an extent proved so by agreeing to participate in testing that had no direct bearing on their immediate coursework, did not translate into proportionally high proficiency scores on the three types of tests (multiple-choice, cloze, and translation-based) used to assess interlanguage development in English syntax, however. Correlations between Motivation Level and performance on these three types of tests ranged from a low of .308 and .364 for freshmen on Translation (from Mandarin or Japanese into English) to a high of .503 and .569 for the last two Multiple-Choice and Cloze-type tests. For sophomores, correlations ranged from a low of .181 on the second Multiple-Choice test to a high of .394 on the first translation. Meanwhile, the level of correlation between scores on a standard grammatical proficiency test (Part II of the CELT) were considerably higher, ranging from a low of .614 for sophomores on the last Multiple-Choice test to a high of .874 on the first translation.[4]

Tables 5 and 6 below show correlation coefficients for Motivation Level, Proficiency Level, and scores on eight tests (three multiple choice-type, T#2, T#5 and T#8, three cloze-type, T#3, T#6 and T#9 and two translations, T#4 and T#7) for the combined sophomore and freshman groups at both universities.

Table 5. Motivation Level and Correlation with Sophomore Test Scores

Multiple Choice	Cloze Procedure	Translation
T#2 Corr .255/r^2.065	T#3 Corr .267/r^2 .071	T#4 Corr. 394/r^2 .156
T#5 .181 / r^2.035	T#6 .316/r^2 .100	T#7 .356 /r^2 .127
T#8 .279 / r^2 .078	T#9 .270/r^2 .073	

Proficiency Level and Correlation with Sophomore Test Scores

[4] StatView 512 was used to calculate all correlation coefficients.

Multiple Choice	Cloze Procedure	Translation
T#2 Corr. .866/r^2 .751	T#3 Corr. .782/r^2 .611	T#4 Corr. .874/r^2 .764
T#5 .801 / r^2 .641	T#6 .624 / r^2 .389	T#7 .825 / r^2 .680
T#8 .848 / r^2 .719	T#9 .614 / r^2 .377	

Table 6 Motivation Level and Correlation with Freshmen Test Scores

Multiple Choice	Cloze Procedure	Translation
T#2 Corr. .441/r^2 195	T#3 Corr. .350/r^2 .122	T#4 Corr. .308/r^2 095
T#5 .421 / r^2 .177	T#6 .499/r^2 .249	T#7 .364 /r^2 .133
T#8 .503 / r^2 .253	T#9 .569/r^2 .324	

Proficiency Level and Correlation with Freshmen Test Scores

Multiple Choice	Cloze Procedure	Translation
T#2 Corr. .814/r^2 .662	T#3 Corr. .698/r^2 488	T#4 Corr. .679/r^2 .462
T#5 .791 / r^2 .626	T#6 .805/ r^2 .649	T#7 .737 / r^2 .542
T#8 .821 / r^2 .674	T#9 .808/ r^2 .652	

Conclusions and Implications

The above results indicate that general verbal ability, as measured by performance on a standard (structure-based) test such as the CELT, shows a consistently higher correlation with performance on a variety of proficiency tests (covering skills in reading comprehension, vocabulary, syntax and writing) than a Motivational assessment. Cumulative rankings of scores indicate that Translation. tests yielded the highest Motivation and Proficiency correlations for sophomores and the lowest correlations for freshmen. These results, which suggest that a standard proficiency test can point to performance on a variety of skill-based tests with nearly 80% accuracy, are decidedly tentative. The profiled group of forty Japanese and Chinese freshmen and sophomores is far too small to provide an accurate indicator of how great a factor attitudes and motivation are in the EFL context. Nonetheless, the mixed results are somewhat reminiscent of those Oller and Chihara (1978) found with a larger group of adult EFL learners at a language school in another Japanese city. Expressing some disappointment over the lack of correlation of affective variables and attained proficiency as shown on both standard achievement tests and Cloze tests in that research study, particularly when compared with higher correlations found in a study that focused on Chinese learners in an ESL setting, Oller's (1981) skepticism over using attitudinal or motivational assessments as indicators of proficiency in a second language is well-founded.

Furthermore, the battery of tests conducted in this research was designed to assess characteristics of Interlanguage Syntax for speakers of both Mandarin and

Japanese, and not to comment on the relationship between affective variables and second language proficiency *per se*. That freshmen and sophomores who were majoring in Liberal Arts and taking English at Hunan University would outscore their Japanese counterparts in the College of Liberal Science at Okayama University was hypothesized *a priori* due to increased emphasis on English at the former school and other factors such as "transfer of training" and predicted extent of "first language transfer" (Selinker, 1972). For all intents and purposes, however, the four groups of students were matched for age, number of years of instruction in English, regional location and restricted access to the target language (and its speakers), and no assumptions were made as to their particular attitudes toward or motivation for learning English.

That both groups of freshmen and sophomores at Hunan University were able to outpoint freshmen and sophomores with comparable backgrounds in English at Okayama National University indicates that motivational and attitudinal factors, in addition to higher general ability in English syntax (the Chinese students averaging 20 points higher on the CELT than the Japanese students), were at work. The difference in mean scores can also be partially explained by looking at the respective academic weight that is placed on English at both universities. While 8 units of English is a general graduation requirement for all liberal arts (and most science) students at Okayama University, English assumes a more specialized role at Hunan University. For example, English courses are offered in connection with the specific needs of students; i.e. "Business English" for future businesspersons and special classes designed for guides and interpreters, language teachers, etc. in an integrated curriculum that emphasizes all four skills. The long tradition of grammar/translation-based instruction which Scovel (1983) Zhuang (1984) and others have noted as characteristic of foreign language instruction in China is gradually changing. With the opening of its doors to other cultures and purveyors of different ideas about language learning, non-native speaking instructors in China are better able to emphasize communicative aspects of the target language and development in practical skill areas. Japan is also trying to diversify its foreign language methodology, but the heavy dosage of "*juken eigo*" (English for testing purposes) and associated grammar/translation-centered instruction that typifies secondary school instruction during the students' formative years has made the switch to a more communicative approach difficult. The Ministry of Education has recently effected ambitious plans to increase the number of native-speaking instructors in the public school sector and promote team-teaching and updated materials, but with only mixed results so far. It is apparent, then, that in many respects, Hunan University is meeting the "instrumental" designs of its young adult constituency more satisfactorily than Okayama University is meeting the "personal needs" of *its* student population.

REFERENCES

Berendt, E. (1990). Chuugoku Shakai in Okeru Eigo no Yakuwari. In N. Honna (Ed.), *Asia no Eigo* (pp. 69-93).

Benson, M. (1991). Attitudes and motivation toward English: A survey of Japanese freshmen. *RELC Journal 22:1*, 34-48.

Berwick, R. and Ross, S. (1989). Motivation after matriculation: Are Japanese learners of English still alive after exam hell?" *JALT Journal 11*, 193-210.

Buck, G. (1988). Testing listening comprehension in Japanese university entrance exams." *JALT Journal 10*, 15-42.

Cambridge Encyclopedia of China. (1991). B. Hook (Ed.), Cambridge: Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge.

Cambridge Encyclopedia of Japan. (1993?. R. Bowring and P. Kornicki (Eds.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chihara, T. and Oller, J. W. (1978). Attitudes and attained proficiency in EFL: A study of adult Japanese speakers. *Language Learning 28*, 55-68.

Fu, G. S. (1975). *A Hong Kong perspective: English language learning and the Chinese student*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Dissertation Series.

Gardner, R. C. and Lambert, W. E. (1972). *Attitudes and motivation in second language learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Gardner, R. C. (1980). On the validity of affective variables in second language acquisition: Conceptual, contextual and statistical considerations. *Language Learning 30*, 255-69.

Hansen, H. E. (1985). English education in Japanese universities and its social context. In C. B. Wordell (Ed.), *A guide to English teaching in Japan* (pp. 143-170). Tokyo: Japan Times, Ltd.

Honna, N. (1990). *Asia no Eigo: Varieties of English in Asia*. Tokyo: Kuroshio.

Kachru, B. (1976). Models of English for the third world. *TESOL Quarterly 10*, 221-39.

Lehmann, W. P. (Ed.) (1975). *Language and linguistics in the People's Republic of China*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

LoCastro, V. (1990). The English in Japanese university entrance exams: A sociocultural analysis. *World Englishes 9*, 343-54.

Maher, J. C. (1984). English language education in Japan: Historical and macro issues in the teaching of English in schools. *Language Learning and Communication 3*, 41-50.

Oller, J. W. (1981). Research on the measurement of affective variables: Some remaining questions. In R. Andersen (Ed.), *New Dimensions in Second Language Acquisition Research* (pp. 14-27). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Oller, J. W., Hudson, A. and Liu, P. F. (1977). Attitudes and attained proficiency in ESL: A sociolinguistic study of native speakers of Chinese in the United States. *Language Learning 27*, 1-27.

Oller, J. W. and Perkins, K. (1980). *Research in language testing: Testing the tests*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Reischauer, E. (1977). *The Japanese*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Ross, H. (1993). *China learns English: Language teaching and social change in the People's Republic*. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press.

Scovel, T. (1983). The impact of foreign experts, methodology and materials on English language study in China. *Language Learning and Communication 2*, 83-92.

Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *IRAL 10*, 209-30.

Shaw, W. D. (1983). Asian student attitudes towards English. In L. E. Smith (Ed.), *Readings in English as an international language* (pp. 21-33). Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Wong, S. C. (1988). What we do and don't know about Chinese learners of English: A critical review of selected research. *RELC Journal 19*, 1-20.

Zhuang, J. (1984). *English teaching in China's colleges.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 245 565)

APPENDIX A
Attitudinal Questionnaire

CIRCLE ONE of the following words to describe how you feel about each of the following:

EXAMPLE: English should be a required course in high school.

STRONGLY AGREE / AGREE / NOT SURE / DISAGREE / STRONGLY DISAGREE

1. English is very useful in the workplace or in most job situations these days.

STRONGLY AGREE / AGREE / NOT SURE / DISAGREE / STRONGLY DISAGREE

2. English helps you make a variety of friends more easily.

STRONGLY AGREE / AGREE / NOT SURE / DISAGREE / STRONGLY DISAGREE

3. A truly educated person should be able to read or understand written or spoken English.

STRONGLY AGREE / AGREE / NOT SURE / DISAGREE / STRONGLY DISAGREE

4. English is very useful for helping us to gain knowledge about life in other countries or to better understand life in other countries.

STRONGLY AGREE / AGREE / NOT SURE / DISAGREE / STRONGLY DISAGREE

5. Knowing at least one foreign language is desirable for social recognition or gaining higher social status.

STRONGLY AGREE / AGREE / NOT SURE / DISAGREE / STRONGLY DISAGREE

6. English is necessary if one wishes to travel abroad or live in another country.

STRONGLY AGREE / AGREE / NOT SURE / DISAGREE / STRONGLY DISAGREE

7. I am taking English mainly to gain college course credit.

YES/NO

8. English is important in order to understand Western thought.

STRONGLY AGREE / AGREE / NOT SURE / DISAGREE / STRONGLY DISAGREE

9. English is necessary in order for us to become truly "internationally minded" or a "world citizen."

STRONGLY AGREE / AGREE / NOT SURE / DISAGREE / STRONGLY DISAGREE

10. Write other personal reason(s) for learning English.

APPENDIX B
Motivational Intensity Scale

INSTRUCTIONS: CIRCLE "YES" OR "NO" as you feel appropriate in each case.

YES/NO 1. Do you plan to continue learning or to use English after you graduate from college?

YES/NO 2. Do you spend more than the minimum time on most of your English class (homework) assignments?

YES/NO 3. Do you make use of the English language outside of school?

YES/NO 4. Do you ever practice English outside of class; for example, attempt to converse with native speakers of English?

YES/NO 5. Is improving your English important to you aside from getting a good mark in school?

YES/NO 6. If English were not (required as) a school subject, would you take time to learn it?

APPENDIX C
Supplementary Questionnaire

Please answer as many of the following questions as you can about using English as a second (or foreign) language.

(1) What kinds of topics do you feel comfortable using English to talk about?

_____ _____ _____

(2) What subjects do you prefer NOT to use English to discuss?

(3) What do you like most about English as a second language?

(4) What do you dislike most about English?

(5) Rate the following aspects of English by circling one description from (A) to (F):

(A) The sound system (or pronunciation) of English

VERY MUCH LIKE LIKE NEUTRAL DISLIKE VERY MUCH DISLIKE

(B) The system of word formation (or morphology) of English

VERY MUCH LIKE LIKE NEUTRAL DISLIKE VERY MUCH DISLIKE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(C) The broadness of the vocabulary (or word choice) available in English

VERY MUCH LIKE LIKE NEUTRAL DISLIKE VERY MUCH DISLIKE

(D) The grammatical system (or syntactic structure) of English

VERY MUCH LIKE LIKE NEUTRAL DISLIKE VERY MUCH DISLIKE

(E) The logicality (or semantic sense) of English

VERY MUCH LIKE LIKE NEUTRAL DISLIKE VERY MUCH DISLIKE

(F) The various cultural aspects of English-speaking peoples

VERY MUCH LIKE LIKE NEUTRAL DISLIKE VERY MUCH DISLIKE

(6) What do you like most about English-speaking people or their cultures?

(7) What do you dislike most about them?

(8) How would you rate yourself on a scale of 1 (total non-proficiency) to 10 (total proficiency or superfluency) in terms of understanding the English language? Circle one. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10